



The City of Seattle

Landmarks Preservation Board

Mailing Address: PO Box 94649, Seattle WA 98124-4649

Street Address: 600 4th Avenue, 4th Floor

LPB 260/20

MINUTES

Landmarks Preservation Board Meeting
City Hall
600 4th Avenue
L2-80, Boards and Commissions Room
Wednesday July 15, 2020 - 3:30 p.m.

Board Members Present

Dean Barnes
Manish Chalana
Roi Chang
Russell Coney
Matt Inpanbutr
Kristen Johnson
Ian Macleod
Harriet Wasserman

Staff

Sarah Sodt
Erin Doherty
Melinda Bloom

Absent

Jordon Kiel

Acting Chair Kristen Johnson called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

In-person attendance is currently prohibited per Washington State Governor's Proclamation No. 20-28.5. Meeting participation was limited to access by the WebEx meeting link or the telephone call-in line provided.

071520.1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 1, 2020

Tabled.

071520.2 PUBLIC COMMENT

Written public comment was received from Jeffrey Ochsner about the Shuey House addition. This was distributed to the Board in advance.

No other public comment.

071520.3 CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

071520.31 Shuey House / Ryker's House

5218 16th Avenue NE

Proposed removal of garage and trees, new construction of adjacent house

Rebecca Schelling explained her family purchased the house in 2000 and after an extensive remodel, the house was landmarked in 2002. She said due to a devastating skateboard accident they need an accessible place for their son to live, and one that will accommodate her elderly mother as well. She said the design intention is to blend in with the neighborhood of classic older homes; to complement and not distract from the landmarked house; and to keep the Shuey house most prominent. She explained the Shuey House sits on two lots; the new addition it proposed for adjacent lot that is hidden by landscape. The existing garage will be demolished as it's too close to the alley to negotiate access. She went over site plan and shared multiple views of the proposed design.

She provided options for exterior: 1) clapboard siding with same exterior colors as historic home to connect addition as a guest house; 2) clapboard siding in a darker color to recede; and, 3) clapboard siding on bottom and battenboard on top 1/3 in another shade, divided with belly band. She proposed dry stacked stone for the chimney, black grid window to tie in with Shuey House, and single light doors. She proposed simple trim and Juliet balcony. She proposed medium or dark gray composition or metal roof. She noted soffit and corbels on existing garage could be removed and re-used. She said existing arbor vitae will be retained.

Ms. Johnson said the project was briefed at the ARC twice in the past.

Mr. Barnes asked about the use of the Shuey House.

Ms. Schelling said they live in that. She said they hope to eventually turn it into a full-time vacation rental; they will live next door. She said it will

become an income-producing entity to provide income for their disabled son. She said they plan to keep it in the family and will own both properties.

Ms. Chang disclosed that the architect is a client of hers.

There was no objection by board or owner to her continued participation.

Mr. Chalana asked about Mr. Ochsner's comment about color of addition.

Ms. Schelling said as an interior designer, in her experience with houses, white reflects the sun and is more dominant. She said the Shuey House is very light in color.

Mr. Chalana preferred the darker option for the new house.

Ms. Johnson concurred. She said the existing garage matches the house; the addition will be different from Shuey House and will be distinguished with color.

Responding to question Ms. Schelling said the house on the other side is brick.

Mr. Inpanbutr said that in the context of the street the dark color helps.

Mr. Barnes preferred Option 3, and said the distinction of color adds a different flavor.

Mr. Chalana concurred but said he would be fine with either option 2 or 3.

Mr. Macleod concurred.

Ms. Johnson agreed.

Ms. Schelling said Option 3 is their preferred choice.

Ms. Chang said the tall fence and hedge will make the new addition less prominent.

Ms. Schelling said they plan to retain both.

Ms. Wasserman preferred Option 3. She said it makes it the nicest new house it could be. There is no faux historicism and no confusion with it being a guest house.

Ms. Johnson preferred shingle roof but did not feel strongly about it. She said the use of elements from old garage is nice but not necessary.

Ms. Chang concurred. She preferred Option 3 and said the composition roof better fits the character of the neighborhood and the Shuey House. She said there is no need to reuse elements from the existing garage.

Mr. Chalana asked if any part of the garage would be saved and reused.

Ms. Schelling said no, it would be demolished due to required setbacks.

Mr. Chalana asked if they considered using the garage.

Ms. Doherty said it was discussed at the first ARC briefing. She said in the staff report she has noted it is a tertiary building.

Action: I move that the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board approve the application for the proposed garage demolition, site alterations, and new construction on the Shuey House property, 5218 16th Avenue NE, as per the attached submittal Option 3, with composite roof, and no need to re-use corbels from garage.

This action is based on the following:

1. The proposed removal of the garage affects the features specified in Ordinance No. 121274. However, the building is tertiary in nature to the main house, and its removal does not detract from significance of the property.
2. The proposed site alterations and new construction do not adversely affect the features or characteristics specified in Ordinance No. 121274, as the proposed size and location of the new structure is deferential to the historic house, and is compatible with the size and scale of the landmark, as per Standard #9 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
3. Were the adjacent new construction to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired, as per Standard #10 of the *Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.
4. The other factors in SMC 25.12.750 are not applicable to this application.

MM/SC/RC/MI 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071520.4 CONTROLS & INCENTIVES

071520.41 Canterbury Court
4225 Brooklyn Avenue NE

Ms. Doherty went through the completed agreement which she said was boiler plate language similar to others approved recently. She noted the hedge on the east is in the right-of-way and not on the site.

Mr. Coney asked which windows are original.

Ms. Doherty said nearly all windows are original, there are only a few minor changes. She said back doors to units have been altered.

Mr. Coney asked if TDR is available.

Ms. Doherty said any available incentive would be available as long as there is an Ordinance in place.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for Canterbury Court, 4225 Brooklyn Avenue NE.

MM/SC/DB/IM 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071520.42 Roy Vue Apartments
615 Bellevue Avenue E

Ms. Doherty explained the completed agreement and went over details.

Mr. Coney said he was surprised that more items weren't requested to be exempt from review..

Ms. Doherty said Ian Morrison (McCullough Hill Leary PS) negotiated on behalf of the owners.

Mr. Coney said it looks fine.

Mr. Chalana asked why the foundation and structural elements were not included.

Ms. Doherty said it was not necessary to include and would have been redundant. She said what might be proposed might be reviewed as maintenance anyway.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for the Roy Vue Apartments, 615 Bellevue Avenue E.

MM/SC/MI/HW 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071520.43 Villa Camini
1205 NE 42nd Street

Ms. Doherty explained the signed agreement and noted language had been added to exempt from review: parking, bollards, and curbs. Handrails, guardrails, and gates are not historic and will be reviewed administratively. Emergency repair language will be added to template.

Jessica Clawson (McCullough Hill Leary PS) said it will be helpful to have that in writing for all owners so they will be aware of the process.

Ms. Chang said it is good to have language there and asked what would happen in emergency.

Ms. Doherty said an emergency Certificate of Approval would be done with coming to board later when there is an opportunity to do that. She said sometimes CHPO or staff has to make a call and noted failing trees as an example.

Ms. Sordt said after the 2001 earthquake lots of parapets fell; emergency Certificates of Approval were issued with condition owners come back with plan to rebuild.

Action: I move to approve Controls and Incentives for Villa Camini, 1205 NE 42nd Street.

MM/SC/MC/HW 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071520.5 DESIGNATION

071520.51 1101 E. Pike Street

Tom Heuser presented (full report in DON file). He provided context of the site and neighborhood. The subject building was built in 1915-1916 as an automobile showroom, garage, and service building. Architect Sønke Engelhart Sønnichsen designed the building in the Commercial or Chicago School style. The primary massing of the building consists of a three-story main volume that contains the former automobile showroom, garage, service, and storage spaces. The primary structure of the building is heavy timber mill construction, with a reinforced concrete foundation. The exterior walls of the building are load-bearing brick masonry. The building is three-stories tall over a full basement, with a partial mezzanine level located between the ground floor and second floor levels. The northwest corner of the subject building is curved, which is an unusual feature for a commercial building during this time period, particularly in Seattle. This curved form recalls the corner entrance

rotunda of the Carson-Pirie-Scott Building in Chicago designed by Louis H. Sullivan, while at the same time foreshadowing building forms of the Streamline Moderne style of the late 1920s and 1930s. This curved corner entrance distinguished the building from the other automobile showroom and service buildings in the area and most likely attracted both the attention of automobile drivers and riders on the streetcar line that once ran along Pike Street. Sønnichsen reprised the curved building corner and entrance pavilion form in his design for the Bekins Moving and Storage Building a few blocks away at the southwest corner of 12th Avenue North and East Madison Street.

Mr. Heuser provided comparison photos of the building from 1916 and 2016 and noted the building has been well-maintained. The painted aluminum storefront doors and sidelights are modern replacements of painted wood double doors with small transom window above and flanking sidelight windows shown in the historic photographs of the building. The original painted wood ceiling above the entrance creates an interior light shelf for the three curved painted wood transom windows located above the entrance doors. The composition of the brick masonry at the corner pavilion is elegantly designed and is representative of the overall composition and treatment of the brick masonry at the north and west primary facades of the building. Brick masonry pilasters rise vertically from stucco plaster plinths at the sidewalk level at each side of the corner pavilion. Each of these pilasters is about three feet wide and features a vertical band of rectangular white glazed ceramic tiles.

Some mullions have been added to the plate glass windows on the north façade otherwise the fire escape and transom window appear original. On the west side window mullions were added, a restaurant was inserted into service entrance, and the gas pump was removed. He provided photos of the showroom in 1919 and 2019 for comparison. The column wainscot and terrazzo floor remain but there have been alterations to east end of the showroom as well as to the mezzanine space. Basement space is used for storage and band practice and has been quite altered. They used to store automobiles in the basement. He showed the second and third floors, originally used for parts and storage but now partitioned into office space.

The first development in the subject area was the 20-acre ranch of John H Nagle, a German Immigrant. Nagle's ranch consisted of fruit trees, vegetables, and cattle. Its estimated location is the 20-acre section of land south of Denny, east of Broadway, west of 12th, and north of Pine most of which is presently occupied by Cal Anderson Park. Nagle ran his farm until the King County Probate Court ordered him to be committed to the new Washington Hospital for the Insane at Fort Steilacoom in 1874. David Denny became the executor of Nagle's estate and maintained Nagle's ranch by leasing it. Starting in 1880, Denny began platting portions of Nagle's land and selling lots with the permission of the probate court. The first of these plats, filed on October 23,

1880, was Nagle's addition, which was comprised of two tracts of land bisected by Nagle's ranch.

Mr. Heuser said after the Great Fire of 1889 development pressure increased in the subject area. The extension of streetcars along Madison in 1890 made the area more accessible and desirable. Residents were primarily working-class tradesmen and farmer. The area grew again when the Klondike Gold Rush began in 1897. A series of regrades along Pike and Pine streets from downtown up to 12th Avenue took place between 1903 and 1920 made the area more accessible. The area moved from residential to commercial.

Mr. Heuser reported that the development of the automobile showroom occurred in three distinct phases. The first began with arrival of automobile in 1900 and automobiles were offered for sale out of general-purpose commercial buildings. Phase II met the demand to sell and store automobiles with livery style buildings. In Phase III dealers began to construct larger and more ornate buildings with large windows through which passers-by could glimpse the vehicle. By the 1940s automobile showrooms had moved to the suburbs with simpler designed buildings and automobiles parked outside.

He said from 1938 – 1994 dry goods manufacturers filled in spaces vacated by auto row. The subject area became a local center of dry goods manufacturing and distribution. There were many linen companies - Standard Linen, Bold Linen, and Steltex along with others in Seattle, competed for contracts with local schools, hospitals, hotels, groceries, etc.

Mr. Heuser said Mary Liebeck was the original owner of the building. She entered the real estate field out of necessity following a divorce and grew a real estate empire. Her son was deaf and attended special schools. Mr. Heuser said she was in court a lot, suing or being sued over property disputes or, in one case, a marriage proposal. She had extensive real estate holdings all over the city and was an active developer. She held this building for 12 years.

He said there was a greater quantity of women in real estate in Seattle. Per historian Diana James, women started small, investing shrewdly and out of necessity, and tended to buy from and sell to other women.

Marvin Anderson said Sønke Engelhart Sønnichsen had a long and varied architectural career. He was born in Norway in 1878 and moved to the United States upon graduation from architectural school in 1902. On his own Sønnichsen designed a wide variety of buildings, from exquisitely detailed single-family residences to commercial buildings, warehouses, and large industrial complexes. Throughout he demonstrated an ability to adapt his talents to the problem at hand, to organize large and complex undertakings, and to respond to local and regional context, all with remarkable creative flexibility.

Sønnichsen demonstrated his planning, design, and technical skills in a broad variety of buildings in Washington, Alaska, and British Columbia, from well-proportioned and exquisitely detailed single-family residences to large industrial complexes, like the six-acre Gulowsen-Grei Engine Co. plant and shipyard. While many of these commissions came from members of the Norwegian community, others can be traced to clients and contractors met working for Somervell and Putnam. Even more came from repeat clients like Henry P. Grant who first leased the building at 1101 E. Pike from Mary Liebeck and then commissioned Sønnichsen for new buildings at 1428 11th Avenue (1919) and 1427 12th Avenue (1922). These buildings were connected to 1101 E. Pike in the back.

Mr. Heuser provided a summary of building ownership (in DON file); there were many owners over time. He said there are three distinct phases of this area: auto, textiles, and art/architecture.

He said the subject building was custom designed for Henry Grant, president of the Seattle Automobile Company who occupied it from March 1916 to October 1922 and again from February 1925 to September of 1927. Grant was involved in the bike riding community and owned one of the earliest gas-powered vehicles (a motorcycle) in the city in 1901. In 1903 Grant sold his first automobile, a Thomas Flyer, to Frank A. Bryant; the sale has been claimed and believed to be the first automobile sale in Seattle.

Mr. Heuser reported Grant's first business devoted to the automobile was the "Seattle Automobile Company", focused entirely on automobiles starting as Western Washington's exclusive dealer of Franklin Automobiles. In this new line of business, Grant was an active organizer among automobilists just like he had been among bicyclists. Between 1903 and 1907 he led many of his customers on road trips to places like Mount Rainier and Snoqualmie Falls and helped fix their cars along the way. He also participated in races with his competitors to demonstrate their products. Perhaps most notable though were his efforts in advocating for the formation of an automobile club in Seattle.

Grant helped organize the Seattle Automobile Club on September 2, 1904. It consisted of 23 of Seattle's 40 automobile owners whose first order of business was to appoint a special committee to confer with the city council on automobile regulations. They would continue to advocate for drivers, necessary regulations, and better roads. They were instrumental in establishing speed limits and license plates. He was a founding member and trustee of the Auto Chamber.

Seattle Automobile Company began to put more emphasis on customer education and team building in its first few years at 1101 E Pike while the country was banding together to support the war effort. They sent their own experts to deliver cars to new drivers and teach them how to drive and

maintain them. They also put a partially stripped automobile on display in the showroom to instruct prospective buyers on its inner workings and regularly published articles in *The Seattle Times* explaining best practices for operation and maintenance.

Commercial Linen occupied the subject building from 1943-53. Founded in 1921, Commercial Linen was the largest supplier of linens and one of the first to establish residence in Pike-Pine. Commercial Linen moved to the subject building in 1944. Benjamin Barlin took over in 1939. H. W. Baker Linen occupied from 1953-83; Norwood Nickols regained control of the company in 1951 and in 1953 sold assets to H. W. Baker Linen. The business was revived with new contracts up through the 1960s and the business moved to Factoria in the 1980s because the space was too small. The business serviced U. W. Hospital, Westin Hotel, Space Needle restaurant, Olympic Hotel among others.

Mr. Coney complimented the presenters on fantastic research and presentation. He asked if this is Sønnichsen's first curved corner.

Mr. Heuser said it was the first.

Mr. Anderson said this was the third building he designed on his own.

Ms. Chang disclosed that she had both worked in and on the subject building.

There was no concern with her continued participation.

Mr. Coney supported designation on criteria D and E but not C. He said it is an amazing property, people, an anchor of the neighborhood. He noted Sønnichsen's early use of the curved corner here and the long, varied history of the building. He hoped the windows would be rehabbed and the terrazzo respected.

Ms. Chang supported designation on C and D and noted the thoroughness of the report. She commented on the different uses of the building and the changes in the neighborhood and said the building still holds its own. She wasn't sure on Criterion E and said she could go either way. She appreciated the very distinct rounded corner.

Mr. Inpanbutr supported designation on criteria C and D and possibly E. He questioned if this was the best curved corner and that the volume and variety of Sønnichsen's work made it harder to identify that. He said it is a nice building and well preserved.

Mr. Chalana said the building is a good example of automobile era building. He said it is well-preserved and he supported designation. He said it could meet all designation criteria, definitely F as it is prominent and is a landmark in its own right. He said it meets Criterion D for its distinct style, rounded corner and fenestration. He said it meets Criterion C for the auto-row period and said he could be convinced about E.

Mr. Macleod supported designation. He commented on the fascinating and thorough presentation. He said there are so many layers to this building and the part about women entrepreneurs was fascinating. He supported criteria C, D but said E was difficult. He said he leaned towards E because of the use of the curved corner. He thanked Mr. Chalana for bringing up Criterion F and said it is an orienting landmark.

Ms. Wasserman said she has always loved this building. She said the presentation was wonderful. She supported designation on criteria C, D, E – noting it is so varied and the use of the corner makes it outstanding, and F.

Mr. Barnes supported designation and noted the outstanding presentation. He supported designation on criteria C, D, and E. He said this is not just another example of Sønnichsen’s work – it is unique and different from others. He appreciated the curved corner and noted the wooden support beams.

Ms. Johnson supported designation and said the history of the building was fascinating. She said it is a striking building and noted the tile detailing. She supported criteria C, D but was unsure about E although she was interested in Sønnichsen and wanted to recognize his body of work.

Mr. Chalana made a case for Criterion F and said it meets the criterion well: it is a visual anchor; it stands on its own; and helps with orientation.

Board members agreed to include criteria C, D, E and F.

Action: I move that the Board approve the designation of the 1101 E. Pike Street, as a Seattle Landmark; noting the legal description above; that the designation is based upon satisfaction of Designation Standard C, D, E and F; that the features and characteristics of the property identified for preservation include: the exterior of the building.

MM/SC/MC/HW 8:0:0 Motion carried.

071520.6 BRIEFING

071520.61 Hiawatha Playfield

Karen Kiest explained the proposed restoration, renovation of park. She proposed relocation of existing playground due to hazardous falling tree branches in current location. She said this is the best realized Olmsted park in the region. She provided images of activities at the park over the years. She said the playfield house is one of the biggest in the country. She said the Olmsteds were critical to setting the standard of healthy living. She said the expansion to the field house happened in the WPA era. She said the wading pool is from the 1950s. She said the fields to the south are part of school district jurisdiction. She said the semi-circular play area is the 3rd version; lawn is used for concerts and picnic events. She said studies have been done to understand the heritage of the park.

She proposed to reintroduce the semi-circular area; add triangular planting spaces as possible; and improve accessibility. She said community input stressed not to fill up the lawn with play equipment and to add natural equipment and climbing pieces. She proposed three options for consideration:

- 1) retain as much lawn as possible; swings; play area for 2 – 5-year-olds; and play area for 5 – 12-year-olds; fitness area; and retain some formality
- 2) Keep play areas together.

Scheme A recommended as a starting point.

Waxing moon, in response to comments and budget. Formality associated with earlier Olmsted concept. Lawn on one side, play areas on the other with path between. Swings and fitness equipment in current locations.

Clara Pang described proposed equipment and noted the community desire for a ‘danger element’ such as a tall slide.

Ms. Kiest said she met with the Seattle Friends of Olmsted Parks about proposed changes. She said a different play area surfacing was explored but it is beyond budget; wood chips are in the plan.

Mr. Barnes said the basketball court is only up to the 3-point line and hoped there would be more room provided for playing.

Ms. Kiest said it is similar to existing which is less than a half court.

Ms. Doherty said the previous plan shows asphalt; the drawing shows a paved area.

Mr. Barnes asked for clarity about fitness area.

Ms. Kiest said there is a grant to put a fitness area in parks and indicated image on page 2 of presentation document.

Ms. Doherty said four or five pieces of equipment are in image.

Ms. Kiest said all equipment would be retained.

Mr. Barnes appreciated the two play areas sited together as it would make it easier for parents to watch kids.

Mr. Chalana was concerned about what was proposed. He said that Olmsted parks are more about passive recreation than active. He asked how what is proposed changes the feel and spirit of original park design.

Ms. Kiest said that aspect of the park is not known to the public. She said athletics and organized gyms were introduced by the Olmsteds, who were initiators of sports playfields.

Mr. Chalana said ball fields and active areas in Central Park in New York were installed later; people thought they were original to the park. He said there is a range of inactiveness; this is a different range of that. He said wading pools are different from play areas.

Ms. Kiest said the gym has doubled in size and the ball fields are devoted to football and athletics. She said the park was designed and intended to be an active park.

Ms. Doherty said the proposed work is sited south of the wading pool.

Ms. Kiest said they tried to keep the active zone and equipment to the edge of the space.

Mr. Chalana asked if the new play area would be larger than existing.

Mr. Kiest said it would be 6000 square feet – roughly the size of the existing play area.

Mr. Coney said he has seen parks change over the years and that he understood changing considerations and access. He suggested minimizing concrete or asphalt. He preferred natural materials such as gravel, rock or cobble. He said to stay true to Olmsted plan.

Ms. Chang asked if the basketball court is in the same location and if it would be new or refurbished.

Ms. Kiest said it slopes now; they proposed a new hoop and surface.

Ms. Chang asked if they had received teen feedback.

Ms. Kiest said teens were excited about basketball and everyone loves swings.

Mr. Barnes asked if the adjacent high school has inside or outside hoops. He said it would be nice for kids to have access to another half court.

Ms. Kiest didn't know.

Ms. Doherty said there do not appear to be outdoor courts at West Seattle High School. But the community center in the park does have indoor courts. She clarified that this project would have come to ARC earlier for a design briefing, if not for the pandemic.

Mr. Macleod asked if the two circles 'slabs' were concrete.

Ms. Kiest said it is a granite slab seating area 'plaza'.

Mr. Barnes asked if more seating would be added.

Ms. Kiest said there is more seating and picnic tables in area to north; there is not enough money in budget for more seating in proposed project area.

Mr. Coney said Cal Anderson and Volunteer Park parks both have wading pools. He said he appreciated the use of natural materials at both locations.

Ms. Kiest said they would be connecting to gravel areas in this project. She went through presentation, indicated that the new play area would extend further than what was shown as existing. She said the part under the trees would be dismantled. The boulders would remain. She said this presentation concludes the schematic design phase and they are not in design development and construction documents. She said they have done two community meetings and two surveys for public input.

Ms. Doherty recommended a re-cap after the meeting and suggested one more briefing.

Mr. Chalana suggested consolidating the play areas, so it doesn't take over the meadow.

Ms. Kiest said this is where they were asked to place it as part of the Parks department program.

Ms. Doherty suggested an overlay of diagrams for original vs. existing vs. proposed for size and location of active areas, and proportion to overall park.

071520.7 STAFF REPORT

Respectfully submitted,

Erin Doherty, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator

Sarah Sodt, Landmarks Preservation Board Coordinator